

## Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 01 OF 06 042002 Z

50

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 USIE-00 NSCE-00 OIC-04

AEC-11 AECE-00 ACDA-19 OMB-01 TRSE-00 RSR-01 INRE-00

SSO-00 CCO-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10 GAC-01 SAJ-01

/143 W

----- 107794

O R 041900 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8331

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US MBFR REP

E. O.11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: US AND NETHERLANDS REPS DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET  
AND HUNGARIAN REPS APRIL 4

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 01 OF 06 042002 Z

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. APRIL 4 SESSION OF THE NETHERLANDS  
AND US REPS DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS

ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES BROUGHT SOME PURELY PROCEDURAL PROGRESS. ALLIES TABLED VERSION OF FEBRUARY 8 PROCEDURES PAPER EXPANDED BY POTENTIAL COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS TO BE MADE BY HUNGARY AND ALLIES AND A FINAL PARAGRAPH CARRYING OVER TO THE NEGOTIATIONS OUTCOME OF PRESENT TALKS. SOVIET AND HUNGARIANS DECLINED TO USE THIS PAPER AS A BASIS OF DISCUSSION AND INSTEAD PROCEEDED TO DEVELOP THEIR OWN LANGUAGE WHICH PROPOSES A LIST OF 19 PARTICIPANTS, 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA AND 8 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS INCLUDING HUNGARY. THE SOVIETS ALSO PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE DEFINITION OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, CHAIRMANSHIP AND RIGHT TO SPEAK. THEY AGREED TO TRY TO PUT DOWN BOTH EASTERN AND WESTERN VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT MATTER IN A SINGLE PAPER, BUT IT PROVED IMPOSSIBLE IN THIS CONNECTION TO AGREE ON A METHOD OF LISTING HUNGARY. THE NEXT SESSION WILL BE HELD ON THE AFTERNOON OF APRIL 5. END SUMMARY.

2. THE NETHERLANDS REP WAS THE FIRST SPEAKER. HE SAID THAT, ON THE LAST OCCASION, THE GROUP HAD AGREED TO CONTINUE ITS EFFORT TO FIND A NEUTRAL SOLUTION AND TO FOCUS IF POSSIBLE ON MORE SPECIFIC FORMULATIONS, LEAVING ASIDE, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, GENERAL STATEMENTS. TODAY ALLIED REPS WOULD LIKE TO DISTRIBUTE, FOR USE AS A WORKING PAPER, AND ON AN INFORMAL AND NON-COMMITAL BASIS, A COPY OF THE FEBRUARY 8 PROCEDURES PAPER WITH WHICH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES WERE ALREADY FAMILIAR. THERE WERE ONLY THREE CHANGES IN THE PAPER: THE ALLIES HAD BRACKETED THE NAME OF HUNGARY IN THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS: THEY HAD INCLUDED IN THE PAPER IN PARAGRAPH 1 THE TEXT OF A SUGGESTED HUNGARIAN STATEMENT AND WESTERN RESPONSE: AND THEY HAD ADDED A FINAL PARAGRAPH ALONG THE LINES OF THEIR REMARKS TO THE EAST ON MARCH 13, WHICH CARRIES OVER TO THE NEGOTIATIONS THE AGREED PATTERN OF PARTICIPATION UNLESS CHANGES ARE AGREED BY CONSENSUS. THE GROUP SHOULD TRY TO MAKE THIS PAPER AS COMPLETE A CATALOGUE, WITHIN REASON, OF THE IDEAS OF BOTH SIDES, BRACKETING THOSE ITEMS OR STATEMENTS WHICH ARE CONSIDERED CONTROVERSIAL SO THAT THE GROUP FIRST MIGHT HAVE A RECORD OF SUCH STATEMENTS, AND SECOND MIGHT START IN THE EFFORT TO NARROW DIFFERENCES. NETHERLANDS REP ASKED WHETHER THERE WERE OTHER ITEMS OR AMENDMENTS

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 01 OF 06 042002 Z

THE EASTERN REPS WOULD LIKE TO SEE APPEAR IN THIS TEXT. ONE MIGHT AS WELL HAVE A COMPLETE CATALOGUE WHILE THE GROUP WAS AT IT.

3. KHESTOV REPLIED. HE SAID HE WAS NOT GOING TO DEAL WITH THE ALLIED PAPER RIGHT NOW. HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT WAS IN IT. TO THE EXTENT THAT IT CONTAINED SOMETHING ABOUT HUNGARY, HE ASSUMED THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD NOT AGREE TO IT AND IT WOULD NOT REFLECT THEIR POSITION

AND THEREFORE NOT BE SOMETHING WITH WHICH THEY COULD WORK. AS REGARDS THE NETHERLANDS REP'S SECOND POINT, AS TO THE ACTUAL METHOD OF FORMULATING POSITIONS, HE WAS READY TO AGREE TO THIS PROPOSAL. THE SOVIETS TOO THOUGHT THE STAGE HAD COME WHEN IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO FORMULATE DIFFERENT IDEAS IN A PROCEDURES DOCUMENT SO AS TO MAKE PRECISE WHAT THE DIFFERENCES WERE. SUCH A PAPER WOULD HAVE AREAS WITH WHICH BOTH SIDES WOULD AGREE AND SOME PROCEDURAL ASPECTS ON WHICH THERE MIGHT BE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION WHICH COULD BE INDICATED BY BRACKETS, BUT HE DID NOT BELIEVE THE PAPER AMBASSADOR QUARLES HAD GIVEN HIM WOULD BE THE KIND OF PAPER ON WHICH ONE COULD WORK TOGETHER. INSTEAD HE PROPOSED THAT THE GROUP MOVE TOGETHER TO WORK OUT A PROCEDURAL PAPER POINT BY POINT TO THAT A CLEAR TEXT COULD BE DEVELOPED. THERE WERE TWO PROBLEMS BEFORE THE GROUP ON THE PRESENT OCCASION. THE FIRST WAS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE FACT THAT DURING THE LAST SESSION THE ALLIES HAD GIVEN THE EASTERN REPS STATEMENTS WHICH MIGHT BE USED BY HUNGARY AND THE WESTERN COUNTRIES. THE SECOND QUESTION WAS TO WORK ON A PROCEDURES DRAFT.

4. THE US REP SAID BOTH ISSUES SHOULD BE HANDLED ON THE SAME BASIS AND NOT SEPARATELY. KHELESTOV REPLIED HE WOULD TURN TO THAT LATER, BUT FIRST HE WISHED TO OUTLINE HIS VIEWS ON THE STATEMENTS THE ALLIES HAD MENTIONED ON THE LAST OCCASION. THEN THE GROUP COULD GO ON TO THE SECOND STEP WHICH WAS THE PROCEDURES DOCUMENT. THEREAFTER THE GROUP COULD TURN TO FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS FROM THE VIEW POINT OF BOTH SIDES.

5. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID WITH REGARD TO THE INFORMAL TEXT OF PROPOSED STATEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE ALLIED  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02743 01 OF 06 042002 Z

REPS ON APRIL 2, HIS COLLEAGUES AND HE HAD AT THE TIME EXPRESSED THE VIEW THAT THESE TEXTS DID NOT MEET THEIR REQUIREMENTS. AFTER CAREFUL STUDY OF THE PROPOSED TEXTS, HE HAD BEEN UNABLE TO CHANGE HIS NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD THEM. IT WENT WITHOUT SAYING THAT HUNGARY WAS UNWILLING TO MAKE A PROPOSED STATEMENT WHICH WOULD PLACE IT IN A SPECIAL POSITION AND WHICH WOULD DETERMINE THAT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION WAS THE SOLE ENLARGEMENT ITEM ON THE AGENDA OF THE GROUP OF 11, WITHOUT SPECIFYING THAT THE SAME GROUP COULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION OF ITALY. THE ALLIED TEXT WAS ONE-SIDED AND IGNORED THE VIEWS OF THE SOCIALIST STATES. HUNGARY AND ITS ALLIES WOULD NOT INSIST NOW THAT THE STATUS OF ALL PARTICIPANTS WOULD HAVE TO BE DETERMINED AT THE PRESENT TIME AND THEY COULD ACCEPT THE IDEA THAT THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS

WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO DISCUSS THE

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

CONFIDENTIAL POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 02 OF 06 042014 Z

72

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 EUR-25 NEA-10 GAC-01

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 IO-12 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 SSO-00 CCO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

/143 W

----- 107866

O R 041900 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8332

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH; FROM US MBFR REP

ENLARGEMENT OF THE GROUP DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT THEY COULD NOT ACCEPT IN ADVANCE THAT SUCH A DISCUSSION SHOULD REVOLVE EXCLUSIVELY AROUND HUNGARY. IF, IN THE LIGHT OF HUNGARY'S ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PROPOSED STATEMENTS, THE WESTERN SIDE SHOULD NONETHELESS PROPOSE A STATEMENT OF ITS OWN WHICH RESERVED THE RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY IN THE GROUP OF 11, IN THIS HYPOTHETICAL SITUATION, HUNGARY WOULD OF COURSE NOT CONSIDER CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 02 OF 06 042014 Z

ITSELF TO BE BOUND BY SUCH A STATEMENT. MOREOVER, IT WOULD STATE ON ITS SIDE THAT IF THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY WERE TO BE CONSIDERED DURING NEGOTIATIONS, THIS SHOULD BE TOGETHER WITH THAT OF ITALY. IN SUMMARY, THE ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS WAS NOT A COMPROMISE SOLUTION AND THE QUEST FOR SUCH A SOLUTION MUST BE CONTINUED. THE ALLIED PROPOSAL DESERVED NOT BRACKETS, BUT COMPLET DELETION.

6. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE HUNGARIAN REP HAD CONVINCINGLY SET FORTH THE CHARACTER OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL OF APRIL 2. THE EASTERN REPS HAD SUGGESTED IN EARLIER SESSIONS, IN THE INTEREST OF REACHING A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE COMPROMISE ON THE STATUS OF POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION IN AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE MUTUAL REDUCTIONS OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL ERUOPE, THAT THIS ISSUE NOT BE ESTABLISHED DEFINITELY AT THE PRESENT TIME. THE SOVIETS WERE READY TO LIST 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AND TO BEAR IN MIND THE POSSIBLILITY OF FUTURE ENLARGEMENT OF THIS GROUP. SUCH AN AGREEMENT WOULD NOT EXCLUDE THE FUTURE POSSIBILITY THAT HUNGARY MIGHT PARTICIPATE AT THE INVITATION OF ALL 11 WITH THE AGREEMENT OF HUNGARY AND IF ITS DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION MATCHED THAT OF ITALY. THIS WAS A FAIR AND NEUTRAL IDEA BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF MUTUAL SECURITY, AND GAVE THE POSSIBILITY OF REACHING AN AGREEMENT ON INCLUSION OF HUNGARY IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. KHLESTOV SAID THERE SHOULD BE NO ALLIED STATEMENTS AND THEY SHOULD CERTAINLY NOT BE CARRIED IN THE TEXT OF EVEN A BRACKETED PROCEDURES PAPER.

7. NETHERLANDS REP NOTED THAT EASTERN REPS HAD AGAIN MENTIONED ITALY. HE SAID ALLIED REPS HAD REPEATEDLY POINTED OUT TO EAST THAT THE STATUS OF ITALY IN THESE TALKS WAS ESTABLISHED IN WRITING BEFORE THE PARTIICPANTS EVEN CAME TO VIENNA, THAT BOTH SIDES HAD AGREED ON THE STATUS OF ROMANIA AND BULGARIA AND THAT BOTH SIDES HAD AGREED ON AT LEAST 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THIS LEFT ONLY THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE OPEN. EAST HAD AGREED THAT THE TALKS CONCERN CENTRAL EUROPE. ITALY WAS NOT IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE STATUS OF ITALY WAS AGREED N BEFORE THESE TALKS STARTED. HUNGARY WAS THE ONLY OPEN ISSUE AND THAT WAS WHY SUGGESTED ALLIED STATEMENTS FOCUSED ON IT.

8. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT, IN THE LAST DISCUSSION ON APRIL 2, BOTH AMB KHLESTOV AND AMB USTOR HAD MADE THE POINT THAT BOTH AGREED THAT THE GROUP WAS ENGAGED IN FINDING A WAY OF PUTTING CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 02 OF 06 042014 Z

HUNGARY IN ABEYANCE. ALLIED REPS BELIEVED IT WAS PROGRESS TO HAVE REACHED THIS CONCLUSION. GROUP WAS NOW IN THE PROCESS OF TRYING TO FIND A FORMULA WHICH WOULD EXPRESS THIS CONCEPT IN A NEUTRAL WAY. AMB KHLESTOV AND AMB USTOR HAD ARGUED THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WHICH THEY PROPOSED IS ONE WAY OF DOING

THIS. ALLIES BELIEVED THERE WERE CLEARER, MORE EFFECTIVE, AND MORE NEUTRAL WAYS OF DOING THIS, AS IN THE EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS WHICH WE SUGGESTED.

9. IN THE TALK ON APRIL 2, AMB USTOR HAD INDICATED THAT, WHEN THE NEGOTIATIONS ARE ACTUALLY UNDER WAY AND ALL PARTIES CAN SEE THE ACTUAL SPAN OF SUBJECTS WHICH THEY COVER, HUNGARY MIGHT DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE IN ONE OR THE OTHER MEASURE ON ITS OWN MERITS OR IN THE LIGHT OF OTHER CONSIDERATIONS WITHOUT NECESSARILY POSING THE REQUIREMENT FOR ASSOCIATION OF CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE SAME MEASURE. ALLIED REPS BELIEVED THERE IS MUCH COMMON SENSE IN THIS OBSERVATION. IT WAS IN THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES TO LEAVE OPEN FOR A LATER TIME THE DETERMINATION OF UNDER WHAT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS HUNGARY MIGHT WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN AGREEMENTS AND MEASURES, RATHER THAN MAKING PARTICIPATION OF ANOTHER COUNTRY AN EXCLUSIVE PRECONDITION. ALLIED REPS HAD SUGGESTED THAT THEIR PROPOSAL FOR EXCHANGING STATEMENTS DEALS WITH THIS POSSIBILITY IN THE MOST DIRECT WAY, YET IS ONE WHICH DOES NOT POSE REQUIREMENTS WHICH ARE TO THE DETRIMENT OF EITHER SIDE.

10. NETHERLANDS REP CONTINUED THAT WHEN THE WESTERN ALLIES CAME TO VIENNA, THEY DID SO ON THE IMPRESSION THAT HUNGARY HAD ACCEPTED THEIR INVITATION TO BECOME A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. THEY HAD INCLUDED HUNGARY AMONG THOSE INVITED TO BECOME DIRECT PARTICIPANTS ON THE BASIS OF CAREFUL CONSIDERATION AND BALANCING OF ADVANTAGE TO BOTH SIDES. INDEED, THEY HAD ADDED BENELUX TO THE LIST OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS AN ELEMENT DESIGNED TO COUNTERBALANCE THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY.

11. WHEN ALLIES ACTUALLY ARRIVED IN VIENNA, THEY DISCOVERED THAT EAST HAD ANOTHER VIEW OF THIS SUBJECT. AFTER CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION, ALLIES AGREED TO TRY TO PLACE THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE IN ABEYANCE. THE ALLIES WERE NOT SUGGESTING THE WITHDRAWAL OF ANY OF THEIR NUMBER FROM THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, BUT FELT THAT IF HUNGARY WERE NOT TO BE LISTED AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT FROM THE OUTSET, THIS MUST AT LEAST BE BALANCED BY STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD PROTECT ALLIED RIGHTS EFFECTIVELY TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF THE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02743 02 OF 06 042014 Z

POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION OF HUNGARY IN DECISIONS. AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION WITHOUT PREJUDICE IN THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS. THIS WAS THE STRAIGHTFORWARD REASON FOR THE ALLIED POSITION.

12. ALLIED REPS HAD POINTED OUT THAT THEY HAVE SECURITY

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

CONFIDENTIAL POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 03 OF 06 042028 Z

72

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 EUR-25 NEA-10 GAC-01

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 IO-12 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 SSO-00 CCO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

/143 W

----- 107969

O R 041900 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8333

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US MBFR REP

INTERESTS WITH REGARD TO HUNGARY JUST AS EASTERN REPS HAD  
AND THAT ALLIES MUST CONSEQUENTLY BE IN A POSITION TO RAISE  
THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS AND BRING  
IT TO A DECISION WITHOUT HAVING THEIR WAY BLOCKED BY THE  
FACT THAT HUNGARY MAY NOT BE LISTED AMONG THE DIRECT  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 03 OF 06 042028 Z

PARTICIPANTS. FOR THEIR PART, ALLIES WERE NOT NOW  
DISCUSSING THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THEY MIGHT RAISE  
THE HUNGARIAN ISSUE DURING THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS, OR  
THE TYPES OF AGREEMENTS OR MEASURES IN WHICH THEY MIGHT  
PROPOSE THE INCLUSION OF HUNGARY. THEREFORE, THEY SAW

NO REASON WHY EAST SHOULD NOW RAISE THE CONDITIONS WHICH THEY WOULD WISH TO BRING UP IN THAT CASE. THIS WAS A TOPIC BEST LEFT TO THE NEGOTIATIONS THEMSELVES, WHEN BOTH SIDES WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SEE IN MORE SPECIFIC FORM THE FULL RANGE OF CONSIDERATIONS WHICH WILL BE INVOLVED.

13. NETHERLANDS REPS CONTINUED THAT ALLIED REPS HAD RECENTLY SET FORTH THE REASONS WHY THE DISCUSSION HAS COME TO FOCUS ON THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION. THERE WAS NO NEED TO GO INTO THEM NOW. ALLIED REPS HAD ALSO SUGGESTED A WAY, IN FACT TWO WAYS, IN WHICH IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO GO IN THIS DIRECTION. IF THIS WAS NOT POSSIBLE THEN THEY SAW NO OTHER WAY TO DEAL WITH THE ISSUE AND TO COME TO SOME OUTCOME OTHER THAN TO MENTION HUNGARY. THIS WAS A POLITICAL FACT OF THE ALLIED POSITION AND BELONGED TO THE REALITIES WHICH HAD TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

14. THE HUNGARIAN REP SAID HE WISHED NO COMMENT, SINCE IT APPEARED THAT HIS REMARKS OF APRIL 2 HAD BEEN MISUNDERSTOOD. HE HAD SAID IT WAS INCONCEIVABLE THAT HUNGARY WOULD NOW ACCEPT THE IDEA THAT ONLY THE STATUS OF HUNGARY WOULD BE KEPT IN ABEYANCE WITHOUT ANY REFERENCE TO ITALY. THIS WAS THE MAIN POINT HE HAD MADE IN THE LAST SESSION. HE HAD TRIED TO EXPLAIN THAT, WHEN THE GROUP OF 11 CONSIDERED AN ISSUE DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, IT WOULD THEN BE EASIER TO DECIDE WHAT SHOULD BE THE CONDITIONS FOR ENLARGED PARTICIPATION, BUT HE HAD ALSO SAID CLEARLY ON THE LAST OCCASION THAT HE WOULD NOT ACCEPT STATEMENTS OF THE KIND PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES WITH HUNGARY THE ONLY ONE KEPT IN ABEYANCE.

15. KHLESTOV SAID HE HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT THE NETHERLANDS REP WAS OPENING A NEW PAGE IN THE DISCUSSION. THIS SHOULD NOW POSSIBLY BE RECIPROCATED BY THE EASTERN SIDE ACCUSING HE WEST OF ALL SORTS OF THINGS. THE GROUP SHOULD BE LOOKING FOR A COMPROMISE. INSTEAD, THE ALLIES WISHED TO MAKE STATEMENTS THAT COULD ONLY PROVOKE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 03 OF 06 042028 Z

REACTION. THIS WAS REGRETTABLE. AS REGARDS THE REMARKS OF THE NETHERLANDS REP, HE WAS SURPRISED TO LEARN THAT HE AND THE HUNGARIAN REP HAD AGREED THAT ONLY THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY REMAINED IN ABEYANCE. GIVEN THESE REMARKS, HE WOULD ASK THE ALLIED REPS TO TAKE NOTE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE AGREED WITH THE WESTERN VIEW THAT ONLY ITALY REMAINED IN ABEYANCE, AND AGREED WITH THE WESTERN PROPOSAL THAT BOTH HUNGARY AND ITALY SHOULD BE IN THE CATEGORY OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. IF THE ALLIED REPS THOUGHT THIS WAS A SERIOUS AND PRODUCTIVE WAY OF WORKING, THEN EVERYONE COULD FOLLOW THIS PATH, AS FOR THE ALLIED UNDERSTANDING THAT ONLY THE QUESTION OF



HUNGARY REMAINS OPEN, CITING AS A BASIS FOR THIS AN EXCHANGE OF NOTES, THE SOVIET REPS HAD ALREADY SAID THEY DID NOT SHARE THIS VIEW AND HAD REPEATEDLY STATED THAT THE ADDITION OF HUNGARY COULD ONLY BE RESOLVED IF ITALY WERE ADDED. IF THE ALLIED REPS DID NOT WISH TO LISTEN TO WHAT THE EASTERN REPS WERE SAYING, THAT WAS THEIR AFFAIR, BUT IF THEY WANTED TO SAY THAT EASTERN POSITION WAS OTHER THAN THE WAY IT HAD BEEN PRESENTED EASTERN REPS WOULD DO THE SAME.

16. KHESTOV ADDED HE WOULD NOT FURTHER ANALYZE THE NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARKS SINCE THEY REFLECTED ALLIED VIEWS AND SOMETIMES RATHER STRANGE

ONES. THIS CREATED THE IMPRESSION THAT WHEN THE ALLIED REPS HEARD THE REMARKS OF THE EAST, THEY PROMPTLY FORGOT THEM AND REMEMBERED ONLY WHAT THEY WANTED TO HEAR. THE ALLIED REPS WERE IN EFFECT ASKING THE EASTERN REPS TO TURN THE CLOCK BACK AND TO START AT THE BEGINNING OF OVER TWO MONTHS OF DISCUSSION. THE EAST WAS READY TO REPEAT EVERYTHING WHICH HAD BEEN SAID IN THE PAST 2 MONTHS, BUT IN THAT CASE THEY WOULD DOUBT THAT THE ALLIES WERE SERIOUSLY INTERESTED IN CONSULTATIONS. BOTH SIDES HAD TWO MONTHS TO PUT FORWARD THEIR VIEWS. THE PRESENT PHASE SHOULD FOCUS ON AN ATTEMPT TO CREATE AN AGREED DOCUMENT. THE NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARKS POSED A SERIOUS QUESTION AS TO WHETHER THE ALLIES WERE REALLY INTERESTED IN WORKING ON AN AGREED DOCUMENT OR WISHED TO REOPEN THE WHOLE DISCUSSION FROM THE BEGINNING. IF THE ALLIES WERE REALLY SERIOUS, THE EASTERN REPS WERE READY TO GO AHEAD BUT THE IMPRESSION WAS THE WEST WANTED TO TURN BACK AND BRAKE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02743 03 OF 06 042028 Z

THE FORWARD MOVEMENT.

17. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT WHEN THE SOVIET REP HAD PRESENTED HIS FORMULA ON ENLARGMENT, THE SOVIET REPS HAD ARGUED THAT HIS CONCEPT HAD THE EFFECT OF PLACING THE SITUATION OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS INTO ABEYANCE. HE HAD POINTED OUT THAT THE SOVIET DELEGATION DID NOT INSIST ON DECIDING HERE AND NOW THE QUESTION OF THEIR POSSIBLE FUTURE PARTICIPATION. THE SOVIET REP HAD DEFINITELY STATED THAT THIS PRESENTATION REFERRED TO THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY. THIS OF COURSE HAD BEEN THE BASIS OF THE NETHERLANDS REP'S REMARKS. THE SOVIET REP HAD REPLIED THAT HE CONSIDERED THE POSITION OF ITALY WAS NOT CLEARLY DEFINED. THE ALLIES DID NOT GO ALONG WITH THAT VIEW AND WISHED TO SAY WHY. THUS, HE WAS NOT TRYING TO PUT INTO THE MOUTH OF THE SOVIET REP IDEAS OR CONCEPTS WHICH THE EAST HAS NOT SET FORTH. ALLIES WERE TRYING TO FIND A SOLUTION WHICH WOULD PROTECT THEIR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

CONFIDENTIAL POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 04 OF 06 042038 Z

72

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 ACDA-19 EUR-25 IO-12 OIC-04 AEC-11

AECE-00 OMB-01 TRSE-00 RSR-01 INRE-00 SSO-00 CCO-00

NSCE-00 USIE-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 NEA-10

GAC-01 SAJ-01 /143 W

----- 108027

O R 041900 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8334

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH; FROM US MBFR REP

THE ALLIED REPS WOULD BE WILLING TO LOOK AT SPECIFIC LANGUAGE.  
THEY AHD ALREADY SAID THEY DOUBTED AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA  
COULD DEAL WITH THEIR PREOCCUPATIONS AND THEY HAD PUT FORWARD  
STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD DO SO BUT WHICH WOULD NOT SEEK UNILATERAL  
ADVANTAGE AND GAVE DUE RESPECT TO THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES.

18. THE US REP SAID WITH REGARD TO THE EARLIER REMARKS BY THE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 04 OF 06 042038 Z

HUNGARIAN REP THAT THE ALLIES WOULD WISH TO MAKE A STATEMENT ON FUTURE HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION, THIS WAS THE CASE AND ALLIED REPS HAD TOLD THE EASTERN REPS THAT THEY WOULD WISH HUNGARY TO MAKE A STATEMENT ALSO. IF THIS COMPROMISE METHOD WERE TO WORK, THE HUNGARIANS SHOULD NOT VITIATE THE FORCE OF THE ALLIED STATEMENT AND THERE SHOULD BE NO MENTION OF ITALY. THERE WERE OTHER FORMULATIONS WHICH WOULD PROTECT HUNGARIAN INTERESTS ADEQUATELY. HE BELIEVED THERE HAD BEEN ENOUGH GENERAL COMMENT AND BOTH SIDES SHOULD NOW GET DOWN TO BUSINESS.

19. KHESTOV SAID THE EASTERN POSITION WAS WELL KNOWN AND HE AGREED THAT THE GROUP SHOULD TURN TO PROCEDURES PAPER BUT WITHOUT FOLLOWING ANY GIVEN PIECE OF PAPER AND INSTEAD FORMULATE A NEW VERSION POINT BY POINT, EXPLORING ANY DIFFERENCE OF VIEWS EN ROUTE. KHESTOV THEN READ OFF THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH WHICH HE SAID COULD BE PARAGRAPH 1 OF AN AGREED PROCEDURES PAPER:  
" REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS WHICH BEGIN IN VIENNA ON JANUARY 31, 1973."

20. THE NETHERLANDS REP ASKED WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE." WHICH HAD BEEN IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE FEB 8 PAPER. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD BE HAPPY TO INCLUDE THIS REFERENCE SOMEWHERE ELSE IN THE PAPER. HE SAID THERE SHOULD FOLLOW A LIST OF 19 COUNTRIES BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAMES.

21. THE US REP SAID HE HAD THREE POINTS: HE HAD NO SPECIFIC OPPOSITION IN PRINCIPLE TO ANOTHER WAY TO PUT THE FIRST PARAGRAPH, BUT IT SHOULD DEFINITELY CONTAIN THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE" HE WANTED TO KNOW THE SENSE OF THE TERM " PREPARATORY" AND HE ALSO WISHED TO KNOW WHAT KHESTOV MEANT BY A LIST OF COUNTRIES BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAMES.

22. KHESTOV REPLIED THAT HE HAD NO GENERAL OBJECTIONS TO INCLUDING THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE," BUT HE FIRST WANTED TO SEE HOW MANY TIMES THIS PHRASE WAS MENTIONED IN THE REMAINDER OF THE PAPER. HE WOULD REVERT LATER TO THE QUESTION OF OFFICIAL DESIGNATION OF THE PARTICIPANTS. FOR THE MOMENT IT WAS ENOUGH TO SAY THAT 19 STATES WOULD BE LISTED. ALLIED REPS INSISTED THAT THE PHRASE " RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE" APPEAR IN ANY FIRST PARAGRAPH. KHESTOV SAID HE WOULD INCLUDE IT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 04 OF 06 042038 Z

IN BRACKETS FOR LATER STUDY. THE FIRST PARAGRAPH MIGHT THEN READ " REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS ( RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE) WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA ON JANUARY 31, 1973:" AS REGARD TO THE TERM " PREPARATORY," THE ONLY SENSE OF THIS TERM WAS TO INDICATE THAT THE CONSULTATIONS WERE DESIGNED TO THE SUBSEQUENT

NEGOTIATIONS IN THE FALL. ALLIES REPS SAID IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO INCLUDE SUCH A WORD, BUT THAT THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE MENTION OF "RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE."

23 KHLESTOV SAID THE SECOND PARAGRAPH WOULD READ, " REPRESENT-ATIVES OF THE FOLLOWING STATES WHICH ARE POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENT IN CENTRAL EUROPE WOULD TAKE THE NECESSARY DECISIONS BY CONSENSUS:" THIS WOULD BE FOLLOWED BY A LIST OF 11 STATES.

24. US REP SAID THE PHRASE " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE" SHOULD BE PLACED IN BRACKETS. THIS PHRASE SHOULD BE GIVEN FURTHER STUDY AS REGARDED THE IMPLICATIONS. FURTHERMORE, 12 STATES SHOULD BE LISTED IN THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE ALLIES WOULD BE WILLING TO PUT HUNGARY IN BRACKETS AND THEN TO INDICATE THAT IT MIGHT BE LEFT IN ABEYANCE IF THERE WERE APPROPRIATE AGREEMENT OF STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD FOLLOW THIS WITH THE TEXTS OF THE PROPOSED ALLIED COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS. IF THE EAST WISHED TO PUT THESE IN BRACKETS TO SIGNIFY THAT THEY WERE CONTENTIOUS AND SHOULD BE RESERVED FOR FUTURE STUDY, THIS MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE.

25. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT IF HUNGARY WER TO BE LISTED AMONG THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, THIS MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 05 OF 06 042111 Z

72  
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 EUR-25 NEA-10 GAC-01

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 IO-12 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 SSO-00 CCO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

/143 W  
----- 108238

O R 041900 Z APR 73  
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8335  
INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW  
USMISSION NATO  
USMISSION GENEVA  
USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE  
USDOCOSOUTH  
USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 5 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

GENEVA FOR DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH

FROM US MBFR REP

26. A COMPARABLE EASTERN STATEMENT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE FOOTNOTE AS FOLLOWS: " THE DELEGATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THE STATEMENTS ABOVE SHOULD NOT BE MADE. HUNGARY SHOULD NOT BE IN THE LIST OF THE STATES LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 2. IF HUNGARY IS CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 05 OF 06 042111 Z

ADDED TO THE LIST IN PARAGRAPH 2, THEN ITALY SHOULD ALSO BE ADDED TO THE LIST."

THE ALLIED REPS OBJECTED THAT SUCH A WAY OF SIGNIFYING THE POSITIONS OF THE TWO SIDES WOULD BE TO ADVANTAGE OF THE EAST AND THE MATTER WAS LEFT UNDECIDED.

27. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED SOVIET LANGUAGE ON ENLARGEMENT WHICH HE SAID WAS ONLY AN APPROXIMATE TEXT IN CONCEPTUAL TERMS, SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE LIST OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN PARA 2 AS A SUBPARAGRAPH. " THE COMPOSITION OF STATES LISTED IN THIS PARA CAN BE ENLARGED BY MEANS OF ADDING OTHER STATES TO THEIR NUMBER. SUCH A SUPPLEMENTARY ENLARGEMENT WOULD BE MADE BY CONSENSUS OF STATES LISTED IN THIS PARAGRAPH AND WITH THE CONSENT OF THE INTERESTED STATE. SUCH INCLUSION BEING WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE NATURE AND DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION OF THE STATE CONCERNED IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS OR DECISIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE. THIS SHOULD BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTICIPANTS."

28. NETHERLANDS REP COMMENTED THAT, REGARDING THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA PROPOSED BY THE EASTERN SIDE, THE ALLIES QUESTIONED ITS DESIRABILITY. HE COULD GIVE ONLY PRELIMINARY COMMENT AT THIS TIME. AS HE HAD POINTED OUT THE EXISTING CONSENSUS RULE, ON WHICH THERE APPEARED TO BE AGREEMENT, WOULD APPEAR ALREADY TO PERMIT THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO INVITE ANOTHER COUNTRY TO PARTICIPATE. THE FORMULATION EAST PROPOSED WAS A VERY BROAD ONE. THERE WAS NOTHING IN IT WHICH INDICATED A LIMITATION AS TO GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF THE ADDITIONAL COUNTRIES WHICH MIGHT BE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE. THERE SHOULD BE A MORE SPECIFIC LIMITATION OF SUCH PARTICIPATION. THEREFORE

THE FORMULA SHOULD CONTAIN SOME LIMITATION OF PARTICIPANTS, PERHAPS A REFERENCE TO STATES WITH TROOPS OR TERRITORY IN CENTRAL EUROPE. KVITSINSKIY SAID THAT SUCH LANGUAGE SHOULD NOT APPEAR. ALLIED REPS HAD NOTED THAT EASTERN FORMULA MIGHT BE CONSIDERED BY SOME COUNTRIES AS PUSHING MATTERS TOO FAR INTO A SUBJECT WHERE THEY HAVE INDICATED THEY WISH TO MAINTAIN THEIR OWN FREEDOM OF DECISION. THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE CONTAINED AN IMPLIED REFERENCE TO FRANCE WHICH HAD MADE ITS POSITION CLEAR.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 05 OF 06 042111 Z

29. NETHERLANDS REP SAID EASTERN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD ALSO BE COMBERSOME IN PRACTICE.  
HOW WOULD IT BE CONCEIVED AS WORKING IN PRACTICE?  
WHAT IF A SITUATION AROSE WHERE HUNGARIAN INCLUSION WAS BEING CONSIDERED? THE ALLIED WANTED A STATEMENT THAT THIS POSSIBILITY WOULD NOT BE PREJUDICED, BUT IN THE EASTERN FORMULA FORMULA, HUNGARY WOULD HAVE TO BE TRANSFERRED BY A DIFFICULT PROCESS FROM ONE CATEGORY TO ANOTHER AND THEN TRANSFERRED OUT WHEN THE DECISION MAKERS DEALT WITH THE NEXT ISSUE. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE POSSIBILITY OF BRINGING HUNGARY INTO PERHAPS A LIMITED MEASURE, THE DECISION MAKERS WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH A COMPLEX PROCEDURE. THIS WAS NOT TRUE OF THE PROPOSED ALLIED STATEMENTS, WHICH PROVIDED A WAY OF DEALING WITH INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS WITHOUT MAKING CHANGES IN THE OVERALL STATUS OF HUNGARY.

30. HUNGARIAN REP SAID AS HE SAW IT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA PROVIDED FOR TWO POSSIBLE SITUATIONS. THE FIRST WAS IF A STATE OUTSIDE THE 19 INDICATED AN INTEREST IN JOINING IN, PERHAPS: FRANCE, THE FRENCH DESIRE COULD THEN BE DISCUSSED BY THE 11. ANOTHER POSSIBILITY WOULD BE THAT A COUNTRY MIGHT BE DRAWN FROM THE LIST OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS. IT SEEMED A MATTER OF COMMON SENSE THAT THE CONSENT OF THAT COUNTRY WOULD BE AVAILABLE AND KNOWN IN ADVANCE BEFORE ACTION BY THE GROUP. IF THE GROUP OF 11 THEN INDICATED THAT IT HAD ON HAND AN EXPRESSION OF INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING FROM HUNGARY, THE GROUP OF 11 COULD DISCUSS THE POSSIBILITY. IT WOULD BE LIKE THE ADMISSION OF A STATE TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. NETHERLANDS REP OBJECTED THAT THIS WAS EXACTLY THE KIND OF COMPLEX OVERFORMULAZATION TO WHICH HE HAD

EARLIER REFERRED. HUNGARIAN REP SAID THIS WAS NOT NECESSARILY THE CASE. THE DECISION COULD INCLUDE A QUESTION OF TO WHAT EXTENT THE APPLICANT STATE SHOULD BE ADMITTED. IF THE SPECIFIC AGREEMENT OR MEASURE WERE CONCLUDED, THEN THE ROLE OF THE INVITED STATE MIGHT AUTOMATICALLY END.

31. SOVIET REP SAID THAT THE TEXT SPOKE FOR ITSELF, BUT PERHAPS IT WOULD CLARIFY THE SITUATION IF IT COULD BE VISUALIZED IN A POSSIBLE PROCEDURES PAPER. PARAGRAPH 2 WOULD LIST 11 STATE WHICH WERE POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS. EIGHT

STATES WOULD HAVE CONSULTATIVE STATUS AND WOULD NOT APPEAR AT  
PRESENT IN THE GROUP OF POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS OF FUTURE AGREEMENTS.  
THIS PUT ALL OF THE CONSULTATIVE PARTICIPANTS IN AN EQUAL SITUATION.  
IT WAS AN HOEST AND EQUITABLE APPROACH. IT GAVE EITHER SIDE THE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 02743 05 OF 06 042111 Z

RIGHT TO RAISE THE PARTICIPATION OF OTHERS IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS.  
THE RIGHT TO DO SO WAS PROTECTED BY THE SUGGESTED TEXT. ACCORDING TO

CONFIDENTIAL

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02743 06 OF 06 042107 Z

72

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 EUR-25 NEA-10 GAC-01

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 ACDA-19 IO-12 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 SSO-00 CCO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

/143 W

----- 108196

O R 041900 Z APR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 8336

INFO SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

USMISSION GENEVA

USDEL SALT TWO

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 6 OF 6 VIENNA 2743

DISTO

ALL OTHER MBFR CAPITALS BY POUCH; FROM US MBFR REP

THAT TEXT, ANY DELEGATION WHICH WISHED TO RAISE THE POSSIBILITY

OF INCLUDING ANY OTHER STATE WOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO DO SO.  
AT THE SAME TIME, THE TEXT PROTECTED THE RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENTS  
WHICH MIGHT NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE BECAUSE IT TOOK INTO ACCOUNT  
THE SOVEREIGN RIGHTS OF SUCH INVITEES, THUS GUARANTEEING THEIR  
INTERESTS. THEREFORE, HE COULD SEE NO REASON OR NEED FOR  
SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS OF THE TYPE PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES.  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02743 06 OF 06 042107 Z

TO GIVE A SPECIFIC EXAMPLE, IN THE AUTUMN NEGOTIATIONS, THERE  
MIGHT BE A DISCUSSION AS TO WHO SHOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL PARTICI-  
PANT. THE ALLIES MIGHT SAY THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE INCLUDED.  
THE RIGHT TO RAISE THIS ISSUE WAS FULLY GUARANTEED TO THE WEST  
BY THE PROPOSED TEXT. AT THE SAME TIME, HUNGARY' S RIGHT TO  
DETERMINE ITS OWN FUTURE POSITION WAS ALSO PROTECTED. AS FOR THE  
NETHERLANDS REP' S REMARK THAT THIS FORMULA WOULD NOT TAKE INTO  
ACCOUNT THE SCOPE AND CHARACTER OF FUTURE PARTICIPANTS, THIS  
WAS NOT SO. IT SHOWED THAT MEMBERS OF THE GROUP OF 11 WOULD HAVE  
TO AGREE TO ANY SUCH EXTENSION ALONG WITH THE COUNTRY CONCERNED.

32. KVITSINSKIY SAID ALLIED REPS WERE ARGUING IT WAS NOT NECESSARY  
TO HAVE AN ENLARGEMENT FORMULA. THEY WANTED AN EXCHANGE OF STATE-  
MENTS INSTEAD. BUT WHAT IF NEGOTIATIONS STARTED AND THE ALLIES  
WISHED TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY AND THE EASTERN SIDE  
WERE NOT BOUND BY THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE WEST? THE EAST WOULD  
THEN SAY THAT THEY WERE SORRY AND RAISE A POINT OF ORDER SAYING  
THAT THERE WAS NO PROVISION FOR ENLARGEMENT. THE ALLIES HAD  
REPUDIATED AN ANLARGEMENT PROPOSAL EARLIER. US REP SAID  
KVITSINSKIY' S STATEMENT WAS BASED ON FALLACIOUS LOGIC BECAUSE  
IT PREMISED AN EASTERN STATEMENT THAT THEY WERE NOT BOUND BY  
THE WESTERN DECLARATION.

33. KHLESTOV SAID THE THIRD PARAGRAPH COULD READ: " THE FOLLOWING  
STATES ARE PARTICIPATING WITH CONSULTATIVE STATUS:" FOLLOWED BY  
A LIST OF EIGHT STATES. NETHERLANDS REP SAID IT WAS NOT NECESSARY  
TO HAVE A LIST OF THESE STATES. THE LIST OF 19 PLUS THE LIST OF  
11 SHOULD BE SUFFICIENT. KVITSINSKIY SAID AFTER A MOMENT' S  
HESITATION, NO, THAT THERE SHOULD BE CLARITY IN THIS MATTER.  
THEREFORE, EACH GROUP OF PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE LISTED UNDER THE  
RPROPER HEADING. US REP SAID HE ASSUMED THAT THE SOVIETS PRO-  
POSED TO LIST HUNGARY IN THE VERSION THEY WERE PROPOSING.  
HOW WOULD THIS BE DONE? KHLESTOV SAID BY PUTTING BOTH HUNGARY  
AND ITALY IN BRACKETS. US REP SAID THIS WAS ABSURD ACCRODING  
TO THE LOGIC OF SOVIET' S ONW POSITION. THE MATTER WAS LEFT  
UNRESOLVED.

34. KHLESTOV SAID THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH OF THE PROPOSED  
PROCEDURES PAPER WOULD READ AS IN PRESENT PARAGRAPH 3 OF

THE PAPER OF FEBRUARY 8: " ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL BE SEATED IN  
ALPHABETICAL ORDER ACCORDING TO THE ENGLISH ALPHABET." HE SAID  
CONFIDENTIAL



PAGE 03 VIENNA 02743 06 OF 06 042107 Z

PARAGRAPH 5 SHOULD READ AS FOLLOWS: " THE CHAIRMANSHIP WILL ROTATE AT EACH MEETING AMONG THE REPRESENTAIVES OF STATES LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 1 IN ALPHABETIC ORDER. THE FIRST CHAIRMAN WILL BE DETERMINED BY LOT."

35. US REP ASKED WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO THE OLD VERSION OF THIS PARAGRAPH WHICH HAD EARLIER BEEN APPROVED BY THE SOVIETS. KHLESTOV SAID THE SOVIETS NOW PREFERRED THE PRESENT VERSION. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE REFERENCE SHOULD BE TO THE GROUP IN PARAGRAPH 2. AFTER SOME DISCUSSION, IT WAS AGREED TO PUT BOTH OF THE NUMBERS 1 AND 2 IN BRACKETS IN THE LANGUAGE. ALLIED REPS SAID THAT WITH THIS EXCEPTION, PARAGRAPH SEEMED IN ORDER BUT RESERVED RIGHT TO COMMENT FURTHER AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THEIR COLLEAGUES.

36. KHLESTOV SAID NEXT PARAGRAPH SHOULD READ" ALL PARTICIPANTS HAVE THE RIGHT TO SPEAK AND TO CIRCULATE DOCUMENTS ON THE SUBJECT MATTER." US REP ASKED WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO PARAGRAPH 6 OF THE EARLIER PAPER. KHLESTOV CLAIMED THE PRESENT VERSION WAS CLEARER. ALLIED REPS PLACED PRESENT VERSION IN BRACKETS. KHLESTOV SAID THE REMAINING PARAGRAPHS OF THE FEBRUARY 8 PAPER WER ACCEPTABLE TO THE SOVIETS. THEY READ AS FOLLOW:

"7. THE MEETINGS WIL BE OPEN ONLY TO THE PARTICIPANTS.  
8. FOLLOWING THE OPENING STATEMENTS, PROCEEDINGS AND DOCUMENTS OF THE MEETINGS WILL BE CONFIDENTIAL EXCEPT FOR THOSE MATTERS ON WHICH IT IS AGREED IN ADVANCE THAT ANOTHER PROCEDURE WILL BE FOLLOWED. THERE WILL BE NO OFFICIAL RECORDS OF MEETINGS.  
9. THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGES WILL BE ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN AND RUSSIAN."

37. US REP ASKED WHAT ABOUT INCLUDING POINT NUMBER 10 PROPOSED BY THE ALLIES EARLIER THAT DAY. KHLESTOV SAID IT WAS TOO EARLY TO CONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL. ALLIED REPS SAID IT SHOULD BE GIVEN SAME STATUS AS SOVIET PROPOSED LANGUAGE. AFTER FURTH

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 07 MAY 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 04 APR 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973VIENNA02743  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19730460/abqcellp.tel  
**Line Count:** 903  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION MBF  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 17  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:** ANOMALY  
**Review Date:** 01 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <01-Aug-2001 by reddocgw>; APPROVED <29-Aug-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 971121  
**Subject:** MBFR: US AND NETHERLANDS REPS DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS      APRIL 4  
**TAGS:** PARM, AU  
**To:** STATE INFO SECDEF  
BONN  
HELSINKI  
LONDON  
MOSCOW  
NATO  
GENEVA

SALT TWO  
USCINCEUR  
USNMR SHAPE  
USDOCOSOUTH  
USLOSACLANT

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005